Application S/N 10/722,804 Amendment Dated: May 11, 2006 Response to Office Action dated: December 20, 2005

## **Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please replace sheet 1 of the drawings with the attached replacement sheet.

Claims 1-15 remain pending in the application. In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because they did not show a second capacitor. Applicants have attached a replacement sheet for sheet 1 that includes a second capacitor C<sub>2</sub>. Portions of the specification have been correspondingly amended. Claims 2 and 4 were objected to as being in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants have amended claims 2 and 4 and request the withdrawal of the objection. Claims 2, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and in response, Applicants have amended all three claims by deleting the text at issue and believe that the amended claims overcome the 112 rejection.

Also in the Office Action, claims 1-12, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,061,956 to Brown, et al. (Brown). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,972,542 to Patino, et al. (Patino).

Independent claims 1, 8 and 9 have been amended to clarify that the voltage level of the input power supply signal is monitored and that the charging switch is activated or deactivated based on the voltage level of this input signal. Claim 8 has also been amended to clarify that the input power supply signal is received in an electronic device having a capacitor with a value high enough to maintain a voltage level of the input power supply signal to indicate that the electronic device is being charged to prevent disabling of a charging sequence for the battery. Support for the amendments can be found on page 5, line 23 to page 6, line 1; page 6, lines 5-13; and page 6, lines 20-23. No new matter has been added.

Application S/N 10/722,804 Amendment Dated: May 11, 2006

Response to Office Action dated: December 20, 2005

In contrast, the control circuit of Brown monitors the voltage of the battery itself and manipulates the switch (12) and the boost circuit (14) based on the battery voltage (see Abstract and col. 3, lines 48-63). In the claimed invention, the input charging signal, not the battery voltage, is monitored and the controller adjusts switch settings based on the voltage level of the input signal. That is, in the present invention, the battery voltage does not play a significant role in determining when to activate or deactivate the switches, other than to help determine the first and second thresholds. Such a process allows the controller to deactivate certain switches when the voltage level of the input signal drops below a predetermined level. As a result, a much smaller capacitor can be implemented in the design of the charger, as the charger no longer has to provide charging current when the voltage level of the incoming signal drops. Applicants also submit that Brown mentions nothing about an electronic device having a capacitor with a value high enough to maintain a voltage level of the input power supply signal to indicate that the electronic device is being charged to prevent disabling of a charging sequence for the battery.

As such, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 9 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from these independent claims are patentable, both based on their dependencies on the independent claims and their patentability on their own. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing

CE12081JEM Patino, et al.

Application S/N 10/722,804

Amendment Dated: May 11, 2006

Response to Office Action dated: December 20, 2005

the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment

was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is

indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the

clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit

any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc. Law Department – MD 1610 8000 W. Sunrise Blvd. Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Larry G. Brown

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 45,834

Tel: (954) 723-4295 direct line

Tel: (954) 723-6449 main line

Fax No.: (954) 723-3871